



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,409	07/04/2003	Chin-Long Lin	68146241-005012	5928

7590 11/30/2006

Ya-Chiao Chang  
c/o BAKER & MCKENZIE  
15F, No. 168 Tun Hwa North Road  
Taipei 105,  
TAIWAN

EXAMINER

LEE, Y YOUNG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/614,409

Applicant(s)

LIN ET AL.

Examiner

Y. Lee

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of inclusion of implied phrases such as "The invention" and "The method according to a preferred embodiment of the invention" and legal phraseology such as "comprises". Correction is required.

See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-17, 19, 20 and 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tan et al (6,075,576).

Tan et al, in Figures 3-6 and 13, discloses a method for display multiple video object planes using the same system and method for determining a display order of incoming video object planes (VOPs) in an image processing system as specified in claims 1-17, 19, 20 and 22-29 of the present invention, the method comprising the steps of: (a) arranging a first queue of a plurality of cells with a first order (e.g. VOP time increment); (b) providing a second queue of a single cell storing an order number (e.g. modulo time base); (c) decoding (e.g. Fig. 12) the incoming video object planes (VOPs); (d) determining whether the incoming VOPs are intra coded (I-VOPs); (e) determining whether the incoming VOPs are predictive coded (P-VOPs); (f) determining whether said incoming VOPs are bidirectional predictive coded (B-VOPs); (g) registering one of the cells of the first queue with a VOP incoming order for the incoming VOPs that are I-VOPs (e.g. Fig. 3); and (h) registering one of the cells of the first queue with a VOP incoming order for the incoming VOPs that are B-VOPs (e.g. Fig. 4).

With respect to claims 2-17, 19, 20 and 22-29, Tan et al also discloses the step of determining whether the single cell of the second queue is null (e.g. "0"); registering one of the cells of the first queue next to one of the registered cells in steps (g) and (h) with the stored order number for the incoming VOPs that are P-VOPs if the single cell of the second queue is not null (e.g. "10"); reading the decoded incoming VOPs according to the first order (i.e. time increment); indicating whether any of the cells in the first queue is registered (e.g. Fig. 3A); indicating whether the single cell of the second queue is registered (e.g. B-VOP).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 18, 21, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al in view of Ohira (2003/0039311).

Although Tan et al discloses a memory (e.g. register) storing the incoming decoded VOPs, it is noted Tan et al differs from the present invention in that it fails to particularly disclose any details of other possible storage types as specified in claims 18, 21, and 30. Ohira however, in Figure 15, illustrates the concept of such well known memory types comprising RAM, DRAM, SRAM, and flash memory, etc used in a common computer management system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, having both the references of Tan et al and Ohira before him/her, to exploit the common computer management system for providing alternative memory storage capacities as taught by Ohira in the image processing system of Tan et al in order to optimally control the entire processing device and operating various types of software.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Y. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7334. The examiner can normally be reached on (571) 272-7334.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Groody can be reached on (571) 272-7950. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/614,409  
Art Unit: 2621

Page 6

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Y. Lee', with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

Y. Lee  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2621

yl